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Abstract

This paper attempts to critically analyze the editorials of two renowned newspapers, namely the “Dawn” of Pakistan and “The New York Times” of America for the portrayal of the Army Public School, Peshawar attack. The ideological square model of Van Dijk is employed as the theoretical framework for the study. The schema of “us” versus “them” is made use of to identify how the Taliban are depicted as “them” and the victims as “us”. This is done through the examination of the lexical choices and syntactic structures. Results reveal that “The New York Times” has dealt with the issue in a more impartial manner than “Dawn”. The attackers are clearly identified as Taliban and the ‘us’ sentiment is as clear as the ‘them’ sentiment. Dawn on the other hand hardly mentions the attackers as Taliban but often terms them as militants. The “us” sentiment is more prominent here in comparison to “them”. Such interesting results warrant more studies in the field to unravel hidden ideologies of newspapers editorials.
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Introduction

In today’s world, media is fast emerging as a force to be recognized as such in its own right. In fact, it is considered to be the fourth pillar of state along with judiciary, legislature and executive. The power and significance of media can be partly attributed to the fact that no matter how insignificant or trivial an event may be, the media can turn it into something very substantial and vice versa, and partly to the globalized nature of the world, where an event cannot be treated in isolation and where it is no more an affair of the concerned area, state or even country.
Because of the power relations of the leading players in the world and also because of the different stakeholders, every news and event becomes international the moment it occurs. Media, then, in all its various forms, has a say in the world’s affairs. It does so in the form of news, articles and editorials, etc.

Editorial serves as the newspaper’s explicit voice (López Hidalgo; Fernández Barrero, 2012 cited in B García Orosa, X López García, S Gallur Santorum, 2013), in terms of the sources or structure of information, selection of topics and use of language. According to Morán Torres (1988), the editorial is a powerful instrument in the origination and propagation of ideological campaigns that orient and even manipulate readers. Most researchers underscore three main features of editorial:

a) It represents and disseminates the institutional opinion on a given topic which it considers to be important and relevant.

b) Apart from providing opinion and assessment on a given topic, the editorial also gives importance to it simply by selecting it as the topic of the day.

c) It is an unsigned article, as it reflects the point of view of the newspaper with respect to a given story, although there may be some exceptions.

Editorials, in the form of the views of the editor on matters of national and international interest, play a significant role in synthesizing and shaping public opinion. Media texts serve as tools for and advocate of social change in one way or the other which enable them to be analyzed from different perspectives (Fairclough, 1995). Van Dijk (2000) considers the discourse of media to be undoubtedly the leading contributor of public opinion. Particular papers have their own particular viewership and viewpoints depending upon their ideological orientation, socio-cultural setting and political alignment. This is why the same event is portrayed differently in different newspaper editorials and headlines.

Editorials are one particular version of media discourse that focus on various aspects including issues, problems and opportunities related to people and society. Van Dijk, (1989) contends that the amount, nature and degree of editorial coverage a conflicts and issues attracts is an indicator of the social and political significance a particular newspaper attributes to such events. Further, the texts serve as official, subjective and persuasive reflection of public opinion. These, in turn, are influenced by ideological
principles governing social judgments and according to Van Dijk (1998b), editorials suggest how members of one group view the others as being right or wrong. Personal bias, however, cannot be completely taken out as editorial opinions are social and institutional and because of this they attract scholarly and research attention.

The fact that the same event or conflict is differently reported, portrayed and analyzed by different newspaper editorials shows their social and institutional nature. Moreover, they usually achieve their ends by employing different linguistic strategies (e.g. lexical choices, syntactic structures and so on). By making use of different syntax and vocabulary, the angle and perspective of a particular stance is modified. This is where critical discourse analysis comes into play to unravel the hidden and not so explicit stances of media discourses.

Given the pivotal role played by the editorials as the shapers and molders of public opinion as well as propagators of the state policies, this study is aimed at analyzing as to how two of the most renowned newspapers, i.e. “Dawn” and “The New York Times” report and interpret one event differently. The incident is the attack on Army Public School, Peshawar, where scores of deaths and casualties resulted eventually. This study is purely limited to the (critical discourse) analysis of the editorials of the mentioned newspapers through an examination of lexical choices and syntactic structures. Hence, the findings and discussions are solely based on the analysis of the editorials.

Army Public School Attack

Since Pakistan joined the U.S. led war on terror in the aftermath of the 9/11 events, the country has witnessed countless bloody attacks and has borne the brunt of being an ally in the war. By choosing to side with the United States and against the then Taliban government in Afghanistan, Pakistan incurred the wrath of the different Taliban factions who resorted to bloody violence against the innocent people of Pakistan. The Taliban, in their war has vowed to injure Pakistan and its people irrespective of their age, sex, status, political alignment etc. But on December 16, 2014, they chose to inflict a deadly, fatal blow on its people in the country’s history. On that day, seven Taliban gunmen entered Army Public School located in Peshawar and home to the children of army men and opened fire at random at the innocent school children. Some of them later on detonated their suicide vests which resulted in more casualties among the children caught up in the institute. Finally the security forces did succeed in killing
the militants and clearing the area but not before 132 people (including children and women) were killed and another 84 injured. The city was bathed in blood and particularly the young blood of innocent minor school going children. Later, one Taliban faction took the responsibility of the deadly attack.

Research Questions

1. How has the Dawn editorial portrayed the Taliban as “them” and the victims as “us”?

2. How has the New York Times depicted the Taliban as “them” and the victims as “us”?

Significance

Ideologies are often constructed and perpetuated through discourse. Language serves as a tool in the hands of users, groups and institutions who manipulate it to their advantage. The current research endeavor is significant on account of focusing attention on this persuasive power of language. While critical discourse analysis is a vibrant discipline in the west, it needs to pick up pace in the Pakistani context, particularly with reference to media discourse. It remains to be explored, to a great extent, how owing to conflicting interests, the same issue is differently portrayed by different media groups. Political alignment, religious affiliation and socio-cultural orientation are some of the important factors that influence particular groups and hence their discourse is molded and modified accordingly.

Although studies have been conducted regarding thematic analysis, the researcher hopes to highlight the importance of linguistic analysis through the interesting findings of this work so that scholars and researchers are inclined towards critical discourse analysis. The analysis of data reveals, for instance, that although the country has suffered a great deal at the hands of the terrorists, the media discourse is still murky, undecided and unclear in identifying, condemning and categorizing them. And since media voices and (to some degree) gives shape to the state narrative on a given issue, it means that our state narrative on terror-related matters is vague and reflects undecidedness. On the other hand, following 9/11, the American discourse (and its state narrative by extension) on war against terrorism is vehement and unequivocal. This study is thus significant in the sense that it warns the readers (in an indirect manner) to be cautious about what they read and not to take
content for granted, rather strive to understand how a particular effect is created with the help of a particular selection and arrangement of words.

**Literature Review**

Newspapers are a very widely read type of discourse and editorials within a paper are a particular type of discourse as such. They reflect socio-political setting of a particular context and mold public opinion in particular direction. The editorials of the two Pakistani newspapers, for example, caught the attention of two researchers, Tabassum Shah and Bilal (2013). They studied the editorials of the daily Dawn and the daily Nation to examine the newspapers’ roles in the ideological construction of the left and right wing. Their focus was on the editorial portrayal of the death of Osama Bin Laden and PNS Mehran base attack. They examined the selected editorials using such discourse-analytical devices as word choices, syntactic structures, global and local semantics and rhetorical structures. Results revealed that editorials are not an impartial representation of issues and problems. On the contrary, they represent the prevailing ideologies of the concerned newspaper.

In order to investigate the portrayal of Iran nuclear program in two different groups’ newspapers, Ahmadian and Farahani (2014) examined the Los Angeles and Tehran Times’ editorials. They focused on how public opinion is formulated and influenced by the power of language. Taking one paper as in-group and the other as out-group representation, the researchers analyze how the two different editorials have differently portrayed Iran’s nuclear program in accordance with their respective ideological standing. They used Van Dijk’s framework of analysis for positive self-presentation and negative other presentation. Focusing on certain discursive strategies like lexicalization and presupposition, the study reveals that in line with their respective ideologies, the same issue has been differently represented by the two newspapers.

Using the same analytic framework of Van Dijk, Tahir (2013) investigated how Muslims are represented in an article published in the “Washington Post”. The article focused on the protests of the Muslims against the publication of the blasphemous cartoons of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). Through the ideological framework of “us vs them”, the researcher explored how the article has finely constructed the underlying beliefs regarding the representation of in-group and out-group. Examining word choices and employing other such strategies, the study
concluded that Muslims and their actions were negatively portrayed as “others” in the article.

Similarly Poorebrahim and Reza (2012) explored how Islam and Muslims are represented in the western discourse by examining the interrelationship of ideology and language. For this purpose, the researcher concentrated on the headlines of the print media in four newspapers, i.e. The Herald Tribune, The Times, The Independent and The New York Times. The ideological square model of Van Dijk, consisting of the positive presentation of the “self” and negative presentation of the “other” was used. Their examination of linguistic choices revealed that Muslims are negatively represented and Islam is frequently stereotyped.

In order to study how the uprising in Libya and Syria is depicted in the news editorials, Afzal Naeem and Harun Minhas (2015) critically analyzed the editorials of two papers, i.e. “The Arab News” of Saudi Arabia and “News International” of Pakistan. The researchers examined how the uprising was portrayed in two different cultural settings. While the Saudi Arabian paper represented in-group editorial voice, the Pakistani newspaper was representative of out-group editorial voice. Van Dijk’s ideological square model was used to analyze the text. Data was analyzed according to the qualitative data analysis software package NVivo 10. Findings reveal that the authorities are portrayed as “them” whereas, the protestors are presented as “us”. Further, the latter are seen as obstacles in the way of change that the common man represents. The study concludes that the Arab News deals the crises with more severity than the News International.

Theoretical Framework

Van Dijk (1998) considers analysis of discourse to be like ideological analysis. He believes that ideologies are usually though not completely articulated and reproduced “through discourse and communication” (1998, p.17). In order to examine the editorials of the newspapers under review, the present study is informed by the “ideological square model” of Van Dijk. This framework employs a “binary schema” associated with the two actors, i.e. “us” and “them”. The value “good” is normally attributed to the “us” group and that of “bad” to the “them” one. With the help of this model, the hidden attitudinal and ideological stances of the editorials will be identified and analyzed to determine how with the employment of certain words and syntactic
structures the two parties (Taliban and the victims) are accordingly represented. It will be seen as to how the issue in general and the actors in particular are described by the two different editorial voices.

**Methodology**

The aim of the current work is to analyze the construction, reproduction and perpetuation of ideology through language used by the two newspapers. This is accomplished drawing on the use of lexical choices and syntactic structures employed in the editorials. It is also seen as to whether a particular text deals with the issue in an overt and explicit manner or express things in a more implicit and covert way. The editorials selected for analysis were published the next day after the Army Public School attack. The daily “Dawn” of Pakistan is selected because it is believed to be more neutral and unbiased in the expression of even controversial matters. On the other hand, “The New York Times” is a prominent newspaper in American settings. This selection is because of the American policy with reference to terrorism and Taliban after 9/11. Thus, the study offers two versions of the attack; the Pakistani version as in-group editorial representation through the editorial of the daily, Dawn and the New York Times version as out-group editorial representation.

Qualitative research design is adopted for this paper to explore how the editorials construct and portray the actors: Taliban vs. those killed and injured. This is why it is interesting to see how the same issue has been taken up by two different papers in two different cultural settings. The analysis include lexical choices and syntactic structures employed and through them to determine the attitude of the editorials in portraying the attackers and the victims. In other words, the aim is to highlight how the “us” sentiment (portrayal of the victims) and the “them” sentiment (portrayal of the terrorists) is articulated through the use of language in the texts.

**Data Analysis**

The analysis of both the editorials revealed that the same issue has been depicted in a different manner by the concerned papers. The lexical and syntactic examination of the words and phrases employed by the two editorials show that “The New York Times” directly mentions the attackers as ‘Taliban’ whereas the Dawn editorial recognizes them as “militants” only. Further, the Taliban are named in a variety of expressions in “The New York Times”. On the other hand, they are mentioned largely by one type of expression in “Dawn”. A comparison of
these words and phrases for Taliban and those killed and injured in both the editorials is given in the following tables.

Table 1

*Words and Expressions Used for the “Attackers” in Both Editorials*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dawn</th>
<th>The New York Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Militants</td>
<td>Pakistani Taliban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The militants</td>
<td>The Taliban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Taliban gunmen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Taliban spokesman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavily armed militants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The militants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunmen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taliban gunman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taliban insurgency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Taliban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Words and Expressions Used for the “Victims/Survivors” in Both Editorials*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dawn</th>
<th>The New York times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpless school children</td>
<td>Students at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead school children</td>
<td>Scared city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More bodies</td>
<td>Mourners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young children in school</td>
<td>The image of children’s bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Vulnerable citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless</td>
<td>Victims’ families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grieving families of the dead</td>
<td>The survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>Desperate relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The survivors</td>
<td>Their children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors</td>
<td>The dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The families of the dead</td>
<td>Us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agency Associated With Others

According to Van Dijk (1998b), responsible agency is in general (at least in English) associated with grammatical subject and initial position. Negative properties attributed to out groups may be brought to the fore by emphasizing their responsible agency. This has been the hallmark of “The New York Times editorial”. Throughout the article, the Taliban are made syntactic agents of dozens of sentences in which they are also semantically held responsible for the carnage. The following are some of the examples with agents/subjects in bold and underlined.

- But on Tuesday, **the Taliban** took their war on education
- **A team of nine Taliban gunmen** stormed through the corridors and assembly hall.
- First **the Pakistani Taliban** bombed or burned over 1,000 schools.
- Then **they** shot Malala Yousafzai,
- But on Tuesday, **the Taliban** took their war on education
- **A team of nine Taliban gunmen** stormed through the corridors and assembly hall,
- **A Taliban spokesman** said the attack had been retaliation for
- **the Pakistani Taliban’s war** has often been taken out on the country’s most vulnerable citizens
- when **nine heavily armed militants**, disguised in paramilitary uniforms, slipped through a military graveyard and
- **They** rushed through the main building, shooting and flinging grenades before reaching the auditorium
- First **they** sprayed the students with bullets;
- then **they** singled out the survivors
- **the militants** sprayed bullets as they rushed into his classroom.
- **the gunmen** had been intent on mounting a long siege
- **They** were there to kill, and this is what they did,”
• Some attackers appeared to be speaking in Arabic

• the Pakistani Taliban had, for the most part, failed to deliver the revenge they had threatened

Passivation and Object Position of “Us”

It is also one of the linguistic features of editorial discourse that one group, normally the “us” group is made the object of sentences. In a similar manner, sentences are drawn in the agentless mode. For example,

• Some of the 1,100 students at the school were lined up.

• and slaughtered with shots to the head.

• Others were gunned down.

• as they cowered under their desks.

• or forced to watch as their teachers were riddled with bullets.

• they sprayed the students with bullets.

• they singled out the survivors.

On the other hand, the “Dawn” editorial focuses more on the “us” sentiment as the victims of the attack are drawn in the passive forms and syntactically highlighted. For example;

• Helpless school children hunted down methodically and relentlessly.

• First a few bodies, dead schoolchildren in bloodied uniforms, then more bodies.

• young children in school, vulnerable, helpless

• the focus must be the grieving families of the dead, the injured survivors and the hundreds of other innocent children who witnessed scenes that will haunt them forever.

• to help the victims in every way possible.
• For the **survivors**, the state can help to ensure the best medical treatment.

• For the **families of the dead**, the state can find a way to honor their sacrifices.

**Results and Discussion**

The beginnings of the editorials of both the papers are marked different. The Pakistani newspaper starts in a more general and indirect manner in a sentence which is agentless; that is the responsibility of the attack is attributed to no syntactic or semantic agency.

“It was an attack so horrifying, so shocking and numbing…….”

The second sentence is drawn in the passive form where the agent “militants” is mentioned at the end. Here again syntactic prominence is shifted towards “helpless” school children and the attackers’ role is played down. In the next few lines also, there is no mention of the attackers in any form and the focus is consistently on the dead and injured school children rather than who are to be held responsible for this carnage. Throughout the whole editorial there is hardly a sentence in which the word “Taliban” is mentioned or they are made the direct agent of sentences. When even the word “militant” is used, it is made the subject of passive sentences where their role and responsibility is mitigated. The analysis of the report reveals that through lexical choices and syntactic structures, the “us” sentiment is categorically brought to the front and the ‘them’ perspective strategically quite down played. Expressions referring to dead and injured children who are vulnerable and helpless, injured survivors, victims, their families and their physical and psychological wounds are mentioned frequently to express solidarity with them.

The “Dawn” editorials while stealthily avoiding to condemn the attack and particularly the attackers, however, puts the blame on the intelligence agencies and security measures taken and should have been taken. According to the report, army public schools were the highly threatened targets by the militants and security in the area should have been very tight. Then, there is the length of the operation which is questioned. It seems the commandos did not have full knowledge of the layout of the building under attack and this is why it took them such a long time to take hold of the situation. Again, keeping the threat in view, was there any prior planning to take safety measures in the eventuality of such an attack? Were there any drills and training acquainting students with
ways how to react and cope with such dangerous situations? These and other similar questions are asked in the editorial to draw attention to lapses in security plans and to stress the fact that those responsible be caught and justice administered.

The “us” sentiment is highlighted again by asking the government and society to make endless efforts to grace the sacrifices of the martyrs and the injured survivors. The editorial ironically points to the fact that this time the help offered to the families of the bereaved must not be a formality and announcing nominal so called “shaheed packages”, a routine in cases of previous such crises of deaths and casualties. The state should take effective medical measures to heal the physical and psychological wounds of the survivors. The editorial also appeals to media and wider society to play their role in making sure that the state does not limit itself to doing the minimum this time and leave no stone unturned in helping the families of the dead and survivors.

In the closing section, the “Dawn” editorial stresses the fact that the state may have intent to fight militancy but lacks an effective strategy to do so. Again, while referring to Taliban, it does not use the exact word but employs “militant”, as has been the practice throughout the article. It further argues that unless there is a strong will to attack the ideological roots of militancy, counter terrorism operations will have no value. The editorial ends by asking the government to acknowledge that it still does not have a strategy to fight militancy and that denial will be a road to even further atrocities.

“The New York Times”, on the other hand, directly mentions the agent not only as “Taliban” but more specifically as “Pakistani Taliban”

“First, the Pakistani Taliban bombed…..”

In the next coming lines also the paper clearly names them by expression like “Taliban”, “Taliban gunmen”, “they”, “the group” and “their war”. Here, the focus is syntactically on them in unequivocal terms and expressions. They are made the agents of direct sentences clearly holding them responsible for the bloodshed committed. Throughout the editorial, such structure is repeated. In contrast to the Dawn report, the “them” sentiment is brought out in unambiguous terms. Apart from making them the syntactic agents of so many sentences, the Taliban are also identified by a variety of different expressions such as militants, gunmen, they, attackers, heavily armed militants, the group etc. Mention is also made of “good Taliban” to remind Pakistan of backing some Taliban
factions as its strategic allies for its own purposes. Quoting one Pakistani celebrity, they have been metaphorically referred to as “animals” as well.

While there is a strong “them sentiment” in the editorial, there is an equal “us sentiment” as well. The students under attack, either killed or injured, the survivors, their families and the victims are made the direct objects of numerous sentences. Similarly, they are also drawn in a variety of lexical expressions like; uniformed school children, children’s bodies, vulnerable citizens, mourners, victims’ families, survivors, desperate relatives, the dead and so on.

Again, what lacked in the “Dawn” editorial, the “New York Times” while quoting Pakistani officials and important personalities, emphasizes the ‘us’ sentiments in a markedly different and clear manner. Referring to finance minister’s saying, the report quotes his words, “this is a time for ‘us’ to show unanimity….”. In another statement, Malala is quoted as saying, “we will never be defeated”. The condemnation of the international community like US, UN and UK is also included to express solidarity with the bereaved nation. Imran khan is also mentioned as though previously criticized for not naming Taliban but this time openly condemned them.

The closing section of the editorial, like that of “Dawn” criticizes the government and leaders of the country for failing to find a solution to the problem of militancy. The newspaper, however, goes a step further to make the leaders and military accomplices in the issue of Taliban. It is referred to in the context of the notion of good and bad Taliban. The paper blames the military for supporting select factions of the militants that share the country’s strategic goals in India and Afghanistan. The political leadership is also made the culprit for not criticizing the militants openly.

It is clear that owing to the cultural, religious and political atmosphere of both the countries, the newspaper editorials have expressed their opinions accordingly. After 9/11, America declared its war on Taliban and vowed to eradicate them in any form and shape. Since then, America is adamantly bent upon not tolerating Taliban violence in any part of the world. Keeping the strategic position of Pakistan and being its ally in the war on terror, America is more interested in what happens in Pakistan and particularly in the context of “Taliban”. This is why in the “New York Times” editorial the Taliban are openly mentioned and harshly criticized. Further, being the sole super power, it also expresses solidarity for the victims of the attack. It is more concerned in the context of Taliban
and Pakistan as key figures in America’s foreign policy. That’s why the “us” sentiment is as strong as the “them” sentiment.

The Dawn editorial is more “us” oriented understandably. The attack has happened within Pakistan and a large number of deaths and casualties have happened. That’s why it mourns the dead in a more powerful manner. Further, it also criticizes the military and the state for not taking adequate measures which could have averted the danger. But keeping the sensitive nature of the term “Taliban”, it hardly mentions them by the name categorically. This may also be because of the religious connotations associated with the term. Throughout the editorial, they are referred to by the term ‘militants’. Again, they are not made the subjects of sentences which directly hold them responsible for the attack. This is because of the ambivalent attitude of state and media towards the issue of Taliban. Once Pakistan strategic allies in the afghan war and even in India, as referred to in “New York Times”, the Taliban remain a force to be reckoned with in the Pakistani context and hence even media is reluctant to name and criticize them openly. So, although “Dawn” is considered to be the most neutral newspaper, still it fails to do justice with Taliban conflict despite the fact that the country suffered a great deal at their hands.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

Editorial opinions are shaped by the cultural, religious and socio-political aspects of the concerned area and hence cannot be completely free from bias. This study attempted to investigate the portrayal of the Taliban as “them” and the victims as “us” in the aftermath of the Army Public School attack in the editorials of the “Dawn” and “New York Times”. Through Van Dijk’s ideological model of “us” versus “them”, the lexical choices and syntactic structures were analyzed. Results revealed that both the newspapers have dealt with the issue in accordance with the socio-political climate of the respective countries. The “New York Times” editorial is more balanced in the representation of the “us” and “them” sentiments. Not only the “Taliban” are clearly mentioned and criticized but the victims are also fairly represented to express solidarity with them. The dawn editorial is more “us” oriented as it is predominantly concerned with the plight of the dead and injured and the victims’ families. But at the same time, the “them” sentiment is weak as the editorial, through its syntactic structures, does not clearly hold the Taliban responsible for the attack.
The results of the paper are interesting in the sense that how the same issue or conflict is depicted differently by different newspapers in different socio-cultural and political settings. This calls for more studies in the relevant field to uncover the concealed ideological stances of newspaper editorials, particularly in the context of in-group and out-group representation. Further, the researcher found the tool of CDA very helpful in identifying the ideologies of dominant groups hidden in the texts of the editorials. The issue of Taliban still remains to be something like a taboo in the media discourse of Pakistan. More honest and impartial research is required to clarify the peoples’, states’ and media’s attitude towards the issue. The ambivalent nature of the issue needs to be decided in clear cut terms so that the state can come out with a judicious policy in dealing with the problem.
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